

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/777,867

Applicant(s)

PHILIPP ET AL.

Examiner

Thanh X Luu

Art Unit

2878

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thanh X Luu.

(3) _____.

(2) Justin Cassell.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 August 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 10, 11, 14 and 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: Naruse.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed how the invention distinguishes over the prior art. Applicant further presented proposed amendments to the claims. Examiner agreed that the addition of the terms "directly opposed" would overcome the prior art of record. Examiner further noted that in claim 11, the illumination of simultaneous light sources could be further clarified by specifying that the light sources simultaneously illuminate at the same wavelengths. Examiner reminded Applicant that further consideration and/or search would be required and an RCE is likely to be necessary. Examiner also agreed to take Applicant's comments into consideration once the amendments are formally filed.